Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 14 Jul 93   Volume 93 : Issue 228

Today's Topics:
Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (5 msgs)
                         machine-generated cw
             machine-generated CW [LONG LONG] (2 msgs)
          The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers (3 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1993 02:12:11 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>I would like to interject something here... I would be willing to bet that
>most hams that have gotten their tickets since about 1975 or so started out
>as CB'ers. Additionally, I would bet that many that were hams prior to
>1975 dabbled in CB either when it first came out or when it peaked in the
>early 1970's. I recently passed my no-code and am working on my General - I
>have been a radio/electronics enthusiast for about 25 years and have dabbled
>in shortwave, scanners and CB's. I do not think my background is unique.

No, I think alot of hams in that age category were introduced to amateur
radio through other mechanisms. However, what CB was then and is now are
two entirely different things.

>Yes, the tests are easy. Yes, the FCC is unable/unwilling to enforce, based
>on priorities and budget cuts. The ARRL seems willing to take up as much
>slack as they can - someone has to, and after the FCC they would seem to be
>the most likely candidate.

Unfortunately, the ARRL has no policing power (as they shouldn't). However,
if the ARRL really represented the interests of amatuers, they would be
lobbying for more enforcement, rather than giving their opinion on such
non-amateur-related issues such as broadcast radio indecent speech.

>o Allow the FCC to charge for CB and ham licenses again. Some may
>have problems with this, but if we expect enforcement, we need to
>fund them.

I'm all for it. I don't see why we don't pay $5/yr for our licenses.
Even a one-time $25 fee would be better than what we have now.

>o Push for better collection of fines. I'm not sure what kind of
>punch the FCC has - but perhaps they could use better support from
>other agencies in collecting fines and tracking down people.

Well, I hate to turn the FCC into your local police department, where
handing out tickets for revenue is a necessity.

>o Offload mundane stuff to the VEC's - such as data entry of license
>applications/upgrades. The VEC would handle data entry and would
>send batches of electronic data to the FCC. Let the FCC handle the
>enforcement, not the paperwork. We would also have to raise the
>testing fee to cover costs.

Actually, I'm all for privatizing the entire amateur licensing system.
And, hopefully the FCC won't design the bid so that only the ARRL and
a handful of other organizations with "x% of amateurs licensed in the
US" can administer it.

>o Organize and train groups of hams around the country to handle the
>initial identification of violators. I know that hams already
>notify the FCC, but this needs to be formalized and training
>provided in order to stay legal and be helpful to the FCC. The
>FCC would have to agree to act on those professional tips but
>would obviously need more funding.

Identification on our part isn't so much a problem as it is a lack
of anything happening once you DO present your evidence.

MD

----

ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu (Michael Fortner) writes:

>Excuse me, but I am waiting for my no-code and I am not a CBer. I did 4 years
>in the Air Force as an Electronic Warfare Systems Technician. I have tried
>before to learn code, but have had a lot of trouble with it. Not all of us
>out here are blessed with the ear for morse code and/or the time to study
>the code. That does not make us second class operators. We can and often
>do contribute to the hobby.

You will note in my previous post I stated two things: 1. In *my* area, and
2. I said *most*.

>In fact, if it was not for the no-code license,
>your precious bands, cw and phone, would be quickly gobbled up by commercial
>interests citing a lack of interest in amateur radio to justify the use for
>just a few operators.

Oh pluh-eze. All the influx of no-code licencees has accomplished around
here is a flooding of the 2mtr band. Not that those of us on 440 really
mind, mind you....

>So, what is wrong with getting more young people into the hobby? If more
>teens and pre-teens start being hams, it could take a way the social view
>of an amateur radio operator as some socially-phobic techno-geek.

Well, while the concept of getting younger people into the hobby may be
a noble one, I do not think that it is all that feasible. Amateur radio
has, and will always be, an adult hobby. Why? Take a look at any radio.
What kid has the money to go out and purchase a $500 2mtr radio? Or,
for that matter, a $1,200 HF box, plus all the accessories?

Oh, sure, "homebrew" you say. That may have been a viable option a
decade ago, when licensed amateurs actually KNEW something about electronics
and the hobby. Today, forget it. Its rote memorization.

>I've been watiting for over 7 weeks for my callsign. I called the FCC at
>(717) 337-1511 and found out that the waiting time for my area (0) is 6 to 8
>weeks for amateurs, but only 2 to 3 weeks for comercial interests.

My wife mailed her 610 to Gettysburg on May 25th. She had her novice ticket
in hand and was on the air by June 21st. Allowing the 1 week for mail from
PA, it effectively took 3 weeks for the FCC to process her license. Why?
No VEC bureaucratic nonsense to get in the way.

>Many of the complaints about code are
>based on the fact that novices and no-code techs have no dx voice privileges,
>with the exception of the often closed 6 meter band. To give them a taste of
>dx and an incentive to upgrade, I think that they should be allowed some
>limited voice on 10 meters.

Why not just give them full "general" privs on HF? Then, clearly, when they've
gotten a taste of "real DX", they'll definitely want to upgrade to get more
bandwidth! NOT!

Most no-coders that I know have upgraded to coded tech not for hf privs,
but simply due to peer pressure. The "how's the code studying going?"
questions wear on them after a while. Once upgraded, they still get into
that 2-meter/10-meter technician rut.

MD

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 20:13:27 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

> *You* must be really naive if you think the FCC dances to the ARRL's tune.
> The FCC does give weight to ARRL's input. And it should, since ARRL
> represents 160k+ licensed amateurs. But I could cite numerous recent
> rulings where the FCC did things differently--sometimes radically so--
> from the way ARRL wanted them. I wish the FCC *did* listen more to the
> ARRL.

Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is
constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and
implemented by said agency. Secondly, the ARRL at my last accounting,
only represents, or says the represent 120k- amateurs in the United
States. And if you look at QST from a few years back, you'll see that
the ARRL went AGAINST the membership in supporting the no-code license.
Why is this? And please, don't use the argument of saving bandwidth. It
wasn't that. How much money does the ARRL make everytime they sell my
name to yet another distributor, or merchant? Hmmm... makes you wonder.

The other thing that bothers me about the ARRL is they constantly stick
their nose into things they have no bearing upon. For instance, the
broadcast radio obscenity hearings are a good example.

But, far be it from me to criticize the all mighty and powerful ARRL.
The only reason myself and many of my friends are members is beacuse of
QST and even thats getting pretty sickening.

Tony

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------
         o        o   Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
          \      /     system @ garlic.sbs.com              Soon W5YI VE
           \__/
  _____(oo)      Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ___  \/
 / | {MTV}||        MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  ||{___}||
   ||-----||   (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
   ^^      ^^  -------------------------------------------------------
```

Date: 14 Jul 93 15:42:16 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>
> > *You* must be really naive if you think the FCC dances to the ARRL's tune.
> > The FCC does give weight to ARRL's input. And it should, since ARRL
> > represents 160k+ licensed amateurs. But I could cite numerous recent
> > rulings where the FCC did things differently--sometimes radically so--
> > from the way ARRL wanted them. I wish the FCC *did* listen more to the
> > ARRL.
>
> Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is
> constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and
> implemented by said agency. Secondly, the ARRL at my last accounting,

   Oh, geez. I am going to end up defending the ARRL on this one.
   As Jon said, there are numerous examples of FCC rulings that went
   against ARRL advice. Yes, the FCC often listens to the ARRL as
   the 'voice of the amateur radio population', but the ARRL influence

is no where near complete.

> only represents, or says the represent 120k- amateurs in the United
> States. And if you look at QST from a few years back, you'll see that
> the ARRL went AGAINST the membership in supporting the no-code license.
> Why is this? And please, don't use the argument of saving bandwidth. It
> wasn't that. How much money does the ARRL make everytime they sell my
> name to yet another distributor, or merchant? Hmmm... makes you wonder.
>
   Personal opinion: The ARRL is a political organization with individuals
   trying to sort out the best answer either for their own personal interests
   or what they perceive are the interests of the ARRL membership. Clearly,
   amateur radio ops (ARRL members included) were and are still split on
   the no-code issue. I believe that as the radio amateur opinion moved
   towards acceptance of the no-code issue, the ARRL tracked along with it.
   Did the organization display great leadership here? Probably not.

>
> The other thing that bothers me about the ARRL is they constantly stick
> their nose into things they have no bearing upon. For instance, the
> broadcast radio obscenity hearings are a good example.
>
   With obscenity an issue in amateur radio, I believe that it is 100%
   appropropriate that the ARRL stick their nose into the issue in other
   radio services.

> But, far be it from me to criticize the all mighty and powerful ARRL.
> The only reason myself and many of my friends are members is beacuse of
> QST and even thats getting pretty sickening.
>
> Tony

   Bob

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1993 05:05:28 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul14.020233.12775@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.
Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu (Michael Fortner) writes:
>
>>So, what is wrong with getting more young people into the hobby? If more
>>teens and pre-teens start being hams, it could take a way the social view
>>of an amateur radio operator as some socially-phobic techno-geek.

>
>Well, while the concept of getting younger people into the hobby may be
>a noble one, I do not think that it is all that feasible. Amateur radio
>has, and will always be, an adult hobby. Why? Take a look at any radio.
>What kid has the money to go out and purchase a $500 2mtr radio? Or,
>for that matter, a $1,200 HF box, plus all the accessories?
>
>Oh, sure, "homebrew" you say. That may have been a viable option a
>decade ago, when licensed amateurs actually KNEW something about electronics
>and the hobby. Today, forget it. Its rote memorization.

Nonsense. Like most people my age, I got into ham radio when I was
13. I was introduced to the service by a high school radio club.
We memorized the rules just like they do today, and we didn't really
understand any of the theory we were taught. Newly licensed amateurs
didn't know any more, if as much, about electronics then than they do
now. We all generated a lot of charred components and got a lot of shocks
after we were licensed as we learned about the practical aspects of radio,
and developed an understanding of what the theory really meant.

And no, we didn't rush out and pester our parents to buy us new commercial
radios. We threw together godawful kludges from salvaged parts, or made do
with old cast off equipment. I converted an old Motorola 5V for two meters,
and built an awful 40 meter AM rig based on a pair of 211As given to me by a
friendly broadcaster. In those days, 1963, a new rig cost over $400, and
that was *serious* money. The dollar is worth about 12 times less today.
I started with a castoff S28 receiver and worked an entire summer to
raise the money for a used NC190. New radios today are so much cheaper
than they were then that most new amateurs immediately rush out and buy
one. That's too bad because they miss a valuable learning experience.

>Most no-coders that I know have upgraded to coded tech not for hf privs,
>but simply due to peer pressure. The "how's the code studying going?"
>questions wear on them after a while. Once upgraded, they still get into
>that 2-meter/10-meter technician rut.

That's basically true. Many of the people I know who have upgraded have
done so just to shut up the old farts. They still operate primarily VHF
and UHF, and many sell their code keys. A few do catch the DX disease,
but they are a minority.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 14 Jul 93 00:30:55 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: machine-generated cw
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver) writes:

> In article <21slr6INNo60@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Will
> s) writes:
>>
>>   CW sending is still an art, and none the worse for that.
>>
> Without any kind of recognizable character such as swing, syncopation, or
> other rcognizable fist it seems like pretty sterile art to me. Kinda
> like a painting of a polar bear in a snow storm. Hams who use iambic
> paddles and such might as well be using a computer. I can't tell the
> difference.

Yeah but there are some of us who like paintings of polar bears in
snowstorms, and black cats that're in coal mines at midnight during a
new moon.

I would rather listen to someone sending with paddles that a straight
key. Why? Because most of the way I learned my code was with tapes that
were generated using a keyer or computer, and on the air contacts with a
large majority of people who were using paddles. Sooooo....

Tony

----
        o   o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
         \   /   system @ garlic.sbs.com
          __/
   _____(oo)   Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /| ___ \/
 / | {MTV}|| MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* ||{___}||
   ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
   ^^   ^^ --

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 13:14:10 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net
Subject: machine-generated CW [LONG LONG]
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver) writes:

>A common practice among CW ops was to add a little flourish at the
>very end of a contact:

>"dit dit di-dit dit"
>or
>"dit di-di-di dit dit"

>Which was replyed to with a "dit dit" followed by the reverse exchange.
>Sorta like dapping or "giving five". Keyboard whackers cannot participate
>in this exchange of course, since they only have one kind of "dit".

Sure they can. Just send EEIE or ESEE. Actually, I think it goes:

     "dit di-dit dit dit"

or EIEE. I still hear this (and have done it) from time to time. Funny
thing, I was thinking about this on the way to work this morning!
--
Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | 'finger lkollar' for ham-related interests.
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | "Didn't vote for the lottery - won't play it."
"[The media] tore down Bush, now they're trying to tear down Clinton.
Are they trying to destroy the presidency?"   - Barry Goldwater

----

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1993 14:11:26 GMT
From: news.crd.ge.com!dssv01!kennykb@uunet.uu.net
Subject: machine-generated CW [LONG LONG]
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <21vh4d$d0b@ornews.intel.com>, zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver)
writes:
|> "dit dit di-dit dit"
|> or
|> "dit di-di-di dit dit"
|>
|> Which was replyed to with a "dit dit" followed by the reverse exchange.
|> Sorta like dapping or "giving five". Keyboard whackers cannot participate
|> in this exchange of course, since they only have one kind of "dit".
|> Paddle pushers can't do it either as far as I know, having never tried
|> using the infernal things.

Sending ESE and answering EE gives the right rhythm, if your spaces
have standard weighting. Forget Farnsworth, though.

73 de ke9tv/2, Kevin KENNY GE Corporate R&D, Niskayuna, New York, USA

Date: 14 Jul 93 18:48:36 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.unomaha.edu!
cwis.unomaha.edu!ncc2001@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

And what about us who can't wait to get our N#xxx calls?

--
| Michael Fortner   * "I've got all this love to give and |
| N0??? (7 weeks and counting) *   so far all I have is my ham radio" |
| ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu   *   -Selma Bouvier |

Date: 14 Jul 93 20:21:09 GMT
From: walter!porthos!prefect!mgsail@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CA5w1F.4zA@newsserver.pixel.kodak.com> wpd@raster.kodak.com (Bill
DeMatties) writes:
>
>   You couldn't pay me to change my call sign!
>
>   Bill DeMatties
>   N2USA

           Nor I!!

        Marv Goldstein   N2OWL   (Advanced)

Date: 14 Jul 93 11:09:14
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-
feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!lynx.unm.edu!dns1.NMSU.Edu!opus!
forozco@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

What about us who never got a no-code license, got a N#XXX, upgraded,
and kept it??

luis
--

Luis F. Orozco   N   5   U   H   B
forozco@dante.nmsu.edu   g   o   o
forozco@freedom.nmsu.edu   l   m   y
                                   y   e

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1993 07:52:41 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul12.125639.22871@ke4zv.uucp>,
<930712.152321.1u0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<1993Jul13.163752.28300@ke4zv.uucp>rman
Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In article <1993Jul13.163752.28300@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

```
>for a bit of HF RTTY. That's less typical I think. Most home
>HF stations seem to be devoted to DXing or ragchewing via voice.
>Still, it's more likely that the ham at home will be using a
>HT rather than a key.
>
>Gary
>
>--
```

Your generalizations are nauseating.

Jeff, NH6IL

Date: 14 Jul 93 13:00:47 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930712.152321.1u0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<1993Jul13.163752.28300@ke4zv.uucp>, <CA59vu.GJp@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In article <CA59vu.GJp@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:
>In article <1993Jul13.163752.28300@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>
>>for a bit of HF RTTY. That's less typical I think. Most home
>>HF stations seem to be devoted to DXing or ragchewing via voice.
>>Still, it's more likely that the ham at home will be using a
>>HT rather than a key.
>
>Your generalizations are nauseating.

Too bad, so sad. They are the result of 30 years of active hamming and
being in contact with many many other active amateurs. NFARL includes
an activity questionaire with their membership renewals. That sample
backs my conclusions. The ARRL contracted with a market research firm
last fall to survey US amateurs. I haven't seen all the results, but
the July QST says that less than 10% of Novice licensees surveyed
operate CW, 5,000 out of a sample size of 55,000. They don't give
breakdowns for other classes in the editorial. Perhaps Dave Summer
would care to comment.

If you poke your nose into HRO as often as I do, you notice that there

is a rapid turnover of VHF/UHF equipment, particularly HTs, but that
the sales of HF gear is much less. That despite the higher margins
involved in them. And the poor sad code keys seem to have a heavy
layer of dust in their cabinet. More striking perhaps is the used
shelf at The Ham Station. They can't keep good VHF/UHF gear on the
shelf, but they have HF equipment that's languished there for over
a year. Ask a used car dealer what it means when something sound
sits on the lot that long.

You say, "Aw ignore him, he's a repeater owner." That's true, but
I also have 4 HF stations, an antique B&W 6100 and Drake 2B that
I still use for RTTY, an IC735 and Dentron MLA2500 that lives mainly
on packet when the 735 isn't in the vehicle, and two rack mount
Scientific Radio HF kilowatt transceivers used for SSB. I've been
active on every band from 160 meters to 2304 MHz, and on 10 GHz.
I have a whole rack of SSB Electronic transverters as well as a
FT736R. And of course I have VHF/UHF FM rigs in both vehicles, and
a HT to carry around. Plus the usual assortment of VHF packet gear,
and a 56 kb GRAPES RF modem. At the moment I have a workshop full of
ATV gear. And yes, as necessity warrants, I've been known to use a code
key, an old WWII Navy jobbie, particularly on satellite contacts.
Like the tortoise, I'm slow, but I get the job done. I got DXing
out of my blood years ago, and don't contest. I used to be net
control for the Kentucky Traffic Net, but not for many years.
Mostly I like to experiment, and to exchange ideas with others
over radio. Does that disqualify me from commenting on the state
of amateur radio?

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #228
****